

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,592 to Aoyama et al. ("Aoyama"). The applicants cancel claims 1-11 without prejudice and add claims 12-24 to more fully claim aspects of the present invention. There are a number of differences between the methods and systems as described and claimed in the present application and those of Aoyama, several of which are now discussed. For at least the reasons set forth below, the applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and request their allowance.

Aoyama discusses a document management system for managing and displaying multiple versions of a plurality of documents and programs. (Col. 1, lines 10-15) Aoyama also is directed to providing collaboration management functionality including managing the state and condition of writing documents. (Col. 1, lines 30-35)

Aoyama professes to address the difficulties associated with handling large numbers of documents in projects such as producing manuals or software in which multiple versions and states of a document must be tracked among a plurality of participants. (Col. 1, lines 20-29) Aoyama presents a stand-alone system for displaying version and configuration information for work products such as disparate documents and program sources generated by other programs. (Col. 1, lines 3-49) To assist in this display functionality, Aoyama tracks a variety of information related to the documents and program sources including a version name, a creation date, configuration information for different versions, etc. (Col. 4, lines 20-22)

Thus, at its core, Aoyama presents a stand-alone system for displaying related information. The system in Aoyama provides an interface for viewing documents from other

programs according to a visual organizational scheme that was not previously available. For example, Aoyama presents an interface that displays a high-level view of a group of related documents according to a two dimensional display that includes version and configuration information. (Col. 8, lines 40-43; fig. 15) The information displayed is displayed differently than the program(s) which generated the related documents would display the information.

By contrast, the present application describes a system that displays information using the original program that created the information, for example in an e-mail browser, such that the original program appears as though it is operating on a given date and time other than the current date and time. (See Applicants' specification page 9, lines 10-14) One advantage of this approach is that users are able to view the information presented using the same familiar interface they always use to view this type of information – there is no need to learn new interfaces or ways of looking at data. Thus, while Aoyama focuses on creating a new interface to reorganize the information in different ways to illustrate relationships, the presently described system displays information via traditional means for displaying the information, but as the information appeared using those means at a previous time.

In addition, the presently described system offers a number of advantages which promote efficient use of network resources. For example, the information displayed includes indications of data objects rather than the objects themselves. (See Applicants' specification page 4, lines 5-7) Thus, the user is able to view the information as previously presented using the same interface, but the data object is not necessarily retrieved (thus creating load on network bandwidth, etc.) unless the user requests otherwise. This is particularly advantageous when applied to data stores containing a large number of data objects, for example to e-mail data stores. Restoring all of

the e-mails in the entire data store would require significant network resources in terms of bandwidth, storage media reservations, and processor cycles. By contrast, displaying only indications of data objects rather than the objects themselves is significantly less resource intensive. Data objects or additional information associated with data objects can then be selectively restored on an individual basis as needed or requested by a user.

With respect to new independent claim 12, Aoyama does not disclose or even suggest a method of displaying a previous state of data in an application program, the method comprising: storing one or more versions of a data store containing a plurality of data objects created by an application program over time; indexing each version of the data store according to a date; and displaying, in the application program, a view of an indication of a version of a data object from the version of the data store whose date corresponds to a user specified date; wherein the view of the indication in the application program is substantially similar to the view of the indication in the application program at the date of the version of the data store whose date corresponds to a user specified date; and wherein the indication provides the option to retrieve at least a portion of the data object. For at least the above reasons, claim 12 is patentable over the cited art.

Similarly, with respect to claim 16, Aoyama does not disclose or even suggest a system for displaying a previous state of data in an application program, the system comprising: a processor; an application program; one or more versions of a data store containing a plurality of data objects created by the application program over time; and a plurality of storage media storing the one or more versions of the data store and communicatively coupled to the processor, the plurality of storage media having data stored in at least one of the plurality of storage media; wherein the processor is programmed to index each version of the data store according to a date; and display, in

the application program, a view of an indication of a version of a data object from the version of the data store whose date corresponds to a user specified date; wherein the view of the indication in the application program is substantially similar to the view of the indication in the application program at the date of the version of the data store whose date corresponds to a user specified date; and wherein the indication provides the option to retrieve at least a portion of the data object. For at least the above reasons, claim 16 is patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 21, Aoyama does not disclose or even suggest a computer usable medium or media storing program code which, when executed on a computerized device, causes the computerized device to execute a method of displaying a previous state of data in an application program, the method comprising: storing one or more versions of a data store containing a plurality of data objects created by an application program over time; indexing each version of the data store according to a date; and displaying, in the application program, a view of an indication of a version of a data object from the version of the data store whose date corresponds to a user specified date; wherein the view of the indication in the application program is substantially similar to the view of the indication in the application program at the date of the version of the data store whose date corresponds to a user specified date; and wherein the indication provides the option to retrieve at least a portion of the data object. For at least the above reasons, claim 21 is patentable over the cited art.

The dependent claims of the present application contain additional features that further substantially distinguish the invention of the present application over Aoyama and the other prior art of record. However, given the applicants' position on the patentability of the independent claims, it is not deemed necessary at this point to delineate such distinctions.

Entry and favorable consideration of the present amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. The Applicant believes that all claims as presently pending are patentable and early allowance is requested. To expedite the prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the Applicant's undersigned representative to discuss any issues regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth H. Ostrow  
Reg. No. 37,410  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER &  
STEINER LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
Tel: (212) 895-2000  
Fax: (212) 895-2900

Dated: December 19, 2003

I hereby certify that the correspondence attached herewith is being transmitted by Certificate of First Class Mailing, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450:



Seth H. Ostrow  
Reg. No. 37,410

12-19-03  
Date